

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 6, 12-13 and 15-28 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 2, 6, 8-13, 15-21 and 23. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 3-5, 7 and 14. New claims added herein are none.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0005] Examiner Osberg and Examiner Huynh graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on July, 19, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0006] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited art, namely Gershony. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0007] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, and I understood the Examiner to indicate that the proposed clarifying claim amendments appeared to distinguish over the cited art of record. For example, the Examiner indicated that clarification regarding a more specific definition of the “first and second graphics systems corresponding to immediate mode and compositional mode graphics systems, respectively”, as well as “a second type of window without a need of using any window handle” distinguished the claims over the cited art, namely Gershony. However, the Examiners indicated that they might need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0008] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0009] If the Examiner’s reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0010] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0011] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 6, 8-13, 15-21, 23 herein.

Formal Matters

[0012] This section addresses any formal matters (e.g., objections) raised by the Examiner.

Claims

[0013] Examiner Osberg objects to the preamble of claims 1-11 for reciting a "system", where Examiner Osberg suggests changing the preamble of these claims to reflect a system stored on a tangible computer-readable medium, because as disclosed by the specification, the Examiner stated that the system tends to be a computer program. Upon further consideration, the Applicant amends these claims using the following claim preamble: "A system, embedded at least in part on a tangible computer readable medium".

[0014] Examiner Osberg objects to claims 12-20 for reciting a "computer readable medium", where Examiner Osberg verified in our aforementioned interview that a "tangible computer-readable storage medium" would overcome her objection. Herein, Applicant amends these claims, as shown above, to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under §§ 102 and/or 103

[0015] Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-13 and 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. In light of the amendments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. As discussed in the Examiner interview, the cited art Gershony does not disclose or describe a "second graphics system being further configured to reference a second type of window without a need of using any windows handle". Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0016] In addition, Examiner Osberg rejects claims 7 and 14 under §103. The Applicant has canceled claims 7 and 14.

[0017] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 and/or § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

Dependent Claims

[0018] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0019] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Dated: ~~ASA~~ 7-30-07

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Kasey C. Christie
Reg. No. 40559
(509) 324-9256 x232
kasey@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com